

## MINUTES

### CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

October 16, 2006

A meeting of the City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

#### Present

Harold Sanger, Chairman  
Michael A. Schoedel, City Manager  
Mark Zorensky  
James Liberman  
Debbie Igielnik  
Marc Lopata

#### Absent:

Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative

#### Also Present:

Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services  
Jason Jaggi, Planner  
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off. He indicated that the agenda will be re-arranged so that the application for architectural review for the Orchard Project (7454 Forsyth) can be heard first, with the Clayton Road proposal to follow.

#### MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 3, 2006 PLAN COMMISSION/ ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

The minutes of the regular meeting of October 3, 2006 were presented for approval. A brief discussion took place regarding the construction time frame for the Orchard Project. Mr. Case indicated that the completion time is based upon the market, but that they do anticipate completion of the project in 3 years. Therefore, the paragraph regarding the construction will be amended to include the language “dependent on the market”. Marc Lopata asked that Page 13, sixth paragraph be amended to include the language “core and shell”. Also, Marc Lopata indicated that he did not ask if the wall would shield noise (as found on Page 15, second paragraph), so the minutes will be revised to state that “*One of the members* asked if it (the wall) will shield noise”. The minutes were then approved, as amended, after having been previously distributed to each individual member.

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – MIXED-USE PROJECT – 7454 FORSYTH (CONTINUED)

Mr. Jay Case, developer (Orchard Development Group) and Mr. Matthew Kuhl, project architect, were in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers read staff's memorandum as follows:

The proposed project will be located on a piece of property which has been vacant for many years. The proposed project consists of three (3) buildings - a twenty (26) story mixed-use tower building, a seven (7) story terrace building and a six (6) story loft building. A turn-around in the middle of the site on Carondelet will feature decorative pavers and will likely be the location for public art. City Streetscape will be installed along Forsyth and outdoor seating for future restaurants will be provided. The site will also feature areas of trees and public seating locations along Carondelet and Forsyth. Signage is shown on the curve of the terrace building, but details are sketchy. At the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, the Architectural Review Board members requested additional material samples. Alderman Lichtenfeld also indicated that the terrace building curve should be redesigned to provide greater visual impact. The applicant will be at the October 16<sup>th</sup> meeting with a flat bed truck containing a section of full brick panel application proposed for the project, as well as other material samples. A new design for the terrace building has also been submitted and included in the packet. Staff's recommendation is to approve subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions contained in site plan review;
2. That a signage package including all signs with specifications be approved by the Architectural Review Board prior to installation of any signage;
3. That restaurants receive a Conditional Use Permit and outdoor dining be approved prior to operating.

Chairman Sanger asked about public art.

Catherine Powers explained that specific language has been incorporated into the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Ordinance regarding public art. She indicated that a recommendation will be made by the City's Art Commission and forwarded to this Board for final review and approval.

Jim Liberman referred to the revised drawings that were previously submitted and forwarded to the members. He noted that the drawings mislabeled the terrace building as the loft building. He indicated his appreciation of the changes made to the plans pursuant to the previous meeting's discussions.

Mr. Case began a PowerPoint presentation. The first slide was a site plan depicting the 3-building development (terrace building along Forsyth, tower building in the interior of the site and loft building that sits along the private road). He indicated that access to the site is off Carondelet. Color renderings (without landscaping) were also presented. He stated they are attempting to create different textures to the project, with "hardscape" elements to include brick pavers, stamped and stained concrete. He indicated that planters have been added in front of the terrace building and that there are two locations for the placement of public art (upper and lower plazas). He stated the planters will be mobile so that they can be relocated or removed.

Mark Zorensky asked the square footage of the plaza area.

Mr. Kuhl replied “about 4,000 sq. ft. (approx. 90 X 45).

Mr. Case commented that although the plan calls for half of that plaza area to be used for outdoor seating, it can be divided any way.

Debbie Igielnik asked if there will be signage for Metro Link.

Mr. Case replied “yes, definitely”.

Marc Lopata asked if they can incorporate a bike rack.

Mr. Case replied “yes”. He indicated that the corner has now been “activated” in that the doors have now been open to the retail space and that signage for the fence will probably be attached to the fence rather than a solid sign.

Mr. Kuhl commented that they are looking to activate the landscape and hardscape areas. The terrace pavers will match City streetscape; tinted concrete will be under the canopy; the seating area will be a Cabernet Red paver. He stated that their 4’ lights will match those of the City’s.

Mark Zorensky asked about the center of the plaza.

Mr. Kuhl indicated they plan to place a public art piece there along with a planter of some type. He stated that the trees on top of the parking area can grow to 15-feet (with 3’ of soil).

Chairman Sanger asked if the lighting is a requirement of the City.

Mike Schoedel commented that City streetscape is being required along Forsyth and Carondelet. He added that the City of University City is allowing Clayton’s streetscape to expand into their City.

Mr. Case asked if he could now proceed with presenting building material samples.

A sample of the metal color mesh to be used for the loft and terrace balconies was presented. Mr. Case indicated that this metal color will match the window detailing. A color swatch depicting the balcony color for the tower building was also presented. Mr. Case indicated that the tower building will have two types of balconies – recessed and slightly projected.

Mark Zorensky asked how the balconies will be protected against standing water.

Mr. Kuhl indicated they will be at a slight tilt.

Mr. Case presented a slide depicting the wall mounted lighting proposed for the balconies. He indicated the lights will shine down.

Chairman Sanger asked if these lights will be switch activated.

Mr. Case replied “yes”.

Slides depicting the preparation of the brick panels to be used for the tower building were presented. Mr. Case indicated that a sample panel is located in the Fire Department for viewing by this Board. He stated the bricks are full-sized and that assembly cost is not a factor, but installation cost is. He stated these panels are assembled off-site.

Jim Liberman asked if these bricks will look as though they were put up brick-by-brick.

Mr. Case replied “yes”.

Mr. Kuhl advised the members that vertical joints will not be visible.

Samples of the brick (Cranberry Colonial) and stone (Gate Bluegrass Pre-cast) to be used for the terrace building were presented. Material samples to be used for the loft and terrace building were also presented. A sample of the brick (Min. Shadow Smooth) for the loft building was presented as well as a sample of the brick accent (Charcoal Gray Smooth) for the tower building. Samples of the glass to be used for all three buildings were then presented.

Chairman Sanger then called for a 10 minute recess in order for the members to proceed to the Fire Department to view the brick panel sample to be used for the tower building.

Mark Zorensky commented that the man-made materials proposed for the project are slightly untraditional.

Marc Lopata indicated that he likes it.

Chairman Sanger voiced his concern about the view from Northmoor as a lot of vegetation along that location was cleared out by Metro. He stated he would like to see that area “softened”.

Being no further questions or comments, Marc Lopata made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and unanimously approved by the Board.

Chairman Sanger stated he looks forward to the project.

Mr. Case thanked City Staff and the City as a whole for the opportunity to present this exciting project.

Catherine Powers advised Mr. Case that the Board of Aldermen will consider the project at their meeting of October 24<sup>th</sup>.

SALE OF CITY OWNED PROPERTY – 6451 CLAYTON ROAD; LOT CONSOLIDATION; SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - 6435-51 CLAYTON ROAD (CONTINUED)

Tyler Stephens, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers indicated that this is continued consideration of all aspects of the proposal from the meeting of October 3<sup>rd</sup>. She indicated that at that meeting, she read all staff's memorandums and recommendations. She indicated that this body (PC/ARB) has final authority for the site plan and architectural aspects of the project and that this body makes a recommendation to the City's Board of Aldermen concerning the sale of the lot and lot consolidation.

Chairman Sanger indicated that he will be happy to hear any new comments. He announced that the architectural aspects of the project are being presented for the first time this evening.

Ms. Shulamith Simon, attorney representing property owners in the Hi-Pointe/DeMun neighborhood, quoted the Ordinance (No. 5906) that adopted the Clayton Road UDD back on October 25, 2005. She stated these regulations provide a basic measure for evaluating a proposal and that its intent is to minimize the project's impact and for which intent provided a basis for the RFP. She stated the intent is to also promote a mixed-use that is compatible with the area and to maintain the area as a visually appealing gateway for the City and adjacent neighborhoods. She stated the proposal does not fairly carry-out this intent for these reasons: the degree of impervious coverage (proposal: 47%; permitted by UDD: 30%), the length of the building (proposal: 205-feet; permitted by UDD: 165-feet) and the height of the building (how interpreted is at question = 3 stories OR 45-feet; this is a 3 ½ story building). She stated that a step-down would be required for this project. She stated the building is higher than 45-feet and that it has a mansard roof versus a gable roof as interpreted by staff. She stated the provisions of the UDD Ordinance do not include an alternate and that even if an alternate is available, there is no justification for it. She stated she has no doubt that a proposal could be presented that would comply with the standards of the UDD. She stated that the intent of the UDD is being sacrificed here as there is no protection to the north and no step-down. She reiterated that this plan would require a step-down. She stated this is a very important submission as it is the first under the UDD Standards and that if deviations are allowed, the intent of the UDD will be negated. She asked that the UDD not be destroyed. She indicated that she will hold her comments regarding the architectural aspects until later.

Mr. Charlie Brennan, 27 Dartford, indicated he followed the UDD process and does not understand why deviations from the Standards would be permitted. He stated approving this project would open Pandora's Box. He stated the neighbors believe that these standards, although not perfect, are the rules (the UDD Standards). He urged the Board to deny a variation from these standards.

Mr. Dan Schlafly, 107 Aberdeen, agreed with the two previous speakers. He stated this project would set a dangerous precedent and asked why violate the first project.

Mr. David Bales, 419 Carswold, asked how height is derived.

Jason Jaggi indicated that height is measured from average existing grade.

Ms. Beth Stohr, 27 Dartford, stated she works with developers in twenty-five states in building affordable housing. She stated the folks that are left are those who reside in the neighborhoods and that the UDD process was a community effort and one that should be adhered to. She asked that the standards set forth in the UDD be adhered to.

Chairman Sanger asked Catherine Powers to provide an explanation of "alternative compliance".

Catherine Powers indicated that to approve an alternate approach, the Plan Commission or ARB must find that the proposed alternative approach accomplishes the intent of these design standards equally well or better than would an approach which complies with these design standards.

Mike Schoedel asked what possible height could be built here.

Catherine Powers indicated that under the base zoning for this property (C-2), a building 5-stories in height or 65-feet could be erected.

Chairman Sanger asked if a previous proposal for this property was for a taller structure.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”.

Jim Liberman asked staff if the roof for the proposed building is gable or mansard.

Catherine Powers indicated that staff considers this building to have a gable roof.

Chairman Sanger asked what a mansard roof looks like.

A sketch depicting a mansard roof as printed from the internet was distributed, as staff had one available.

Chairman Sanger asked if staff determined height from average existing grade to the mid-point of the roof.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”. She indicated that this is common practice.

Chairman Sanger asked what percentage of residential living space is under the gable roof.

Mr. Stephens replied 75 to 80%.

Ms. Jean Cody, 6431 Clayton Road, asked that the members refer to the roof plan sheet (A1.4). She stated the east and west ends of the roof are flat and that the main portion of the building also has a flat roof and because of that, she measures that about 80% of the roof is flat.

Debbie Igielnik commented that there are obviously two differing opinions here.

Mr. Stephens asked that the members turn to the elevations page Sheet A2.0. He stated that the roof is gable when viewing from Clayton Road and the alley and would guess that the building is 75% gable. He agreed that the roof is flat on the east and west ends, but that in terms of elevations, the roof is gable.

Mr. Paul Bridgman, 6310 Alamo, commented that there are two categories that height can be viewed – 3 stories or 45-feet in height or less than 3 stories or 45-feet. He stated by definition, the greater of the two would permit a building up to 165-feet long and that the other category (lesser category) would permit a building up to 80-feet. He stated if this project falls in the lesser of the two, that this building is 2 ½ times longer than what is permitted.

City Attorney O'Keefe began review of the Code so he could later make a determination.

Jason Jaggi read staff's memorandum regarding the architectural aspects of the project as follows:

The proposed development features a 3-½ story building consisting of 27 residential housing units and 8,999 square feet of ground floor commercial space. The building will be constructed of red brick with a metal tile green-colored roof and metal rails on the balconies. The base of the building is primarily glass storefront windows on the Clayton Road façade. Windows will be brown-colored wood clad. The Clayton Road Urban Design District provides standards for building height. The applicant has reduced the building height to 45 feet, which is 20 feet below the allowable 65 feet for the Zoning District. The front yard area along Clayton Road contains 2-foot high planter boxes. The building is "notched" on the corner of Clayton Road and Seminary Place adjacent to the commercial space to provide a open appearance to the street. Mechanical equipment will be placed on the roof with metal screening. Trash will be stored in a trash room accessible from the garage. The overall design is reflective of the adjacent buildings with the off-sets, red-colored brick, and green-colored roof. There are; however, certain elements of the design which do not seem to be reflective of the surrounding area. The design of the roof does not seem to coordinate well with the building, nor does the all-glass storefront windows. Staff would prefer the roof provide more traditional design elements and that brick be added to the first floor columns to create a more balanced design. Additionally, the balcony on the southwest corner of the building does not seem integrated with the design of the building. Furthermore, staff would prefer that the planter boxes be removed in favor of a landscaped lawn area which would be more compatible with the adjacent properties. Staff's recommendation is to approve subject to the following:

1. Redesign the roof structure to provide a traditional dormer appearance per Architectural Review Board approval.
2. Provide additional areas of brick on the first floor and brick the columns per Architectural Review Board approval.
3. Eliminate the balcony on the southwest corner of the building or redesign to provide greater integration into the façade, possibly utilizing more brick banding in the notched area.
4. Eliminate the planter boxes in favor of a landscaped lawn area for staff review and approval.
5. All conditions contained in the Site Plan/Planned Unit Development memorandum.

Chairman Sanger asked Mr. Stephens to discuss the impervious coverage issue. He stated that he was previously asked to provide individual walkways to the retail space.

Mr. Stephens indicated that they could reduce the impervious coverage to 30% but that they were asked to incorporate individual pathways to the retail entrances, which they have done. He stated they have also incorporated a green roof (environmentally friendly) to the structure on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. He stated this green roof makes up the impervious coverage overage by more than six times. He reminded the members that although not credited by the City, porous pavers are being used for the sidewalks.

A discussion regarding staff's recommendations ensued. Mr. Stephens referred to staff recommendation No. 4, reminding the members that Alderman Lichtenfeld had previously suggested these planter boxes.

City Attorney O'Keefe commented that this building, although 3 ½ stories, does not exceed 45-feet in height and that Option (d) of the CR-UDD Standards, Section V (Design Standards), Subsection B (Architectural Character and Compatibility), Subsection 2 (Building Height/Massing/Form...), (b) (4) (iv) Option D reads: "The total length of a building may be increased to a maximum of 165 feet provided that a minimum of 3 offsets are provided along the front façade of the building and (b) Offsets shall be a minimum of 5-feet in depth." He stated the premise is that the building exceeds 3 stories, but not 45-feet.

Mr. Stephens stated that from the onset of this project, he worked with staff about the height issue and that they have attempted to reduce the height by lengthening the building. He commented that they could build a 5-story, 65-feet in height building without the need for "alternate compliance".

Marc Lopata commented that the project would also need step-backs according to the UDD.

Catherine Powers commented that staff's interpretation was that because the building did not exceed 45-feet in height, there was no need for a step-back.

Jason Jaggi indicated that all other residential districts in the City permit half stories under a sloping roof without that half story being "counted" when determining height.

Chairman Sanger stated he believed this was resolved. He asked what the rule is.

Catherine Powers reiterated that staff determined that the building did not exceed 45-feet in height and that typically, half stories under sloping roofs are not counted. She stated that is how height is determined/considered in all residential districts and that this is primarily a residential building.

City Attorney O'Keefe stated that under the general application of the Zoning Ordinance, a half story is not counted as a story and that is how staff derived their view of the project. He stated that standard compliance would allow for an 80-foot building length or longer if alternative compliance is used.

Chairman Sanger asked that if the building is considered 3 stories, standard compliance would allow for an 80-foot building length.

City Attorney O'Keefe agreed. He stated he is sorry if he misspoke earlier. He reminded everyone that this building is being constructed on multiple lots combined.

Chairman Sanger commented that if the building is considered to be more than 3 stories or 45-feet, then under standard compliance, the maximum building length could be 165-feet.

Ms. Simon stated that if the UDD did not intend to include buildings taller than 3 stories (a 3 ½ story building), the language should have read 4 stories. She stated this renders the provisions meaningless and that the base zoning is negated by this UDD. She stated the fact is that this building is more than 3 stories so they automatically qualify for a 165-foot building.



City Attorney O’Keefe commented that the UDD does not define “story”. He stated he disagrees with Ms. Simon’s comment that the base zoning is negated by the UDD; the UDD supersedes the base zoning, not negates it.

Mr. Mike Hughes, 6239 San Bonita, a 25+ year Hi-Pointe/DeMun resident, indicated his support of the proposal. He stated it will provide residential housing along Clayton Road and will be an upgrade to the neighborhood.

Mr. Stephens referred to staff recommendation No. 3. He stated the notch follows the neighborhood. With regard to staff recommendation No. 2, he stated that the intent was to open up the corner as much as possible. Mr. Stephens then presented slides of other mixed-use buildings (in and out of the area) that are not all brick on the first floor. He stated that they have incorporated a brick ledge into the building, but feel that brick columns would not be appropriate. He stated that the previously, the glass was a curtain wall but they have since revised the glass to include mullions. With regard to staff recommendation No. 1, he is requesting that the roof remain as designed.

Catherine Powers commented that a traditional dormer would be more compatible and would like a redesign of the west end of the building.

Mr. Stephens commented that he did not see dormers in the area with the exception of a few single family residences.

Chairman Sanger asked if the west roof exceeds the height of the gables.

Mr. Stephens replied “no”; he stated it is actually a little lower. Samples of the brick and window (wood clad aluminum, charcoal in color) were presented as well as a sample of the roofing material (diagonal interlocking aluminum tile). A sample of the fabric for the awnings and green screen were also presented. Mr. Stephens indicated that the green wall material will allow ventilation and will create a green screen. He stated the green wall will expand the entire length of the back of the parking area (north side). He provided examples of where green walls have been used: Grand Center (Continental Building) and in the Central West End behind Maryland Plaza. He advised the members that at the request of the City’s Fire Department, openings of 3 to 4 feet will be provided to allow firemen access to the building. A sample of the mesh to be used for the balconies was presented as well as the stone (Northfreed Prairie stone) banding.

Mark Zorensky asked if any thought was given to pitch the roof at each end.

Mr. Stephens replied “yes”, but they thought it better the way it is proposed. He stated the ends cannot be seen from the street.

Mark Zorensky asked if they cannot be seen from the south side of Clayton Road.

Mr. Stephens indicated that only a portion of the roof would be seen from the south side of Clayton Road.

Marc Lopata asked about LEED certification.

Mr. Michael Byrd with Schwetye Architects advised the members that they have initiated the initial certification and is still discussing the level of standard.

Chairman Sanger asked if LEED certification is required.

Catherine Powers replied “no”; it is a recommendation.

Chairman Sanger indicated that he would like to see LEED certification for this project.

Marc Lopata asked if the sections of green roof would be constructed to meet LEED Standards.

Mr. Byrd replied “yes”.

Marc Lopata commented that LEED is a benefit to the community.

Chairman Sanger agreed.

Mr. Bridgman indicated that the UDD limits the use of materials to masonry (brick or brick and stone) and the use of divided light windows above the first floor. He stated the roof should be terra cotta or tile accents versus aluminum. He stated he finds the design to be of a warehouse style.

Mr. Bales commented that the west end of the building seems to be more of an appendage.

Mr. Tom Lee, 8125 Westmoreland and owner of area property, supports the proposal.

Marc Lopata suggested continuing consideration of the proposal.

Chairman Sanger declined requesting a continuance.

Robert & Julie Clemens, 6353 Clayton Road, commented that they believe the design shows the strength of the UDD. They indicated that 80% of the buildings are 3 stories tall and that this development is essential for the City and ideal for the neighborhood. They believe the design fits in well.

Ima Jean Dwyer, 6226 Northmoor (former Alamo resident) indicated that the building looks like a 4 story building and is out of sync with the area. She stated there are no other aluminum roofs in the neighborhood and asked that the project be denied. She stated she also does not like the brick.

Ms. Suzanne Anderson, 6365 Clayton Road, applauds the project and believes it will encourage foot traffic. She stated she does, however, have some concern with regard to the materials.

Chairman Sanger stated he would prefer all aspects of the project with the exception of the architectural portion. He stated his opinion is that he believes it is a great solution for the area, although not architecturally perfect. He stated he likes the brick banding on the bottom and that he would prefer the planters versus open landscape. He stated he feels this development is great use of the property and that he sympathizes with those residents who object to it. He stated this building will be standing long after he and most others are gone. He reminded everyone that this is a commercially zoned

district/street and loves that residential is being incorporated into the project. He stated he will vote in favor of the project.

Mark Zorensky indicated he agrees with the Chairman's comments.

Debbie Igielnik indicated she has questions about how the UDD is interpreted by staff. She indicated that she is in favor of developing that corner but would like to see the west side of the building "broken up".

Jim Liberman indicated that he likes the building's architecture as-is, but that the UDD is being tortured.

Chairman Sanger commented that this Commission can approve as proposed if deemed appropriate to do so.

City Attorney O'Keefe agreed.

Marc Lopata stated he agrees with the Chairman in that he would, too, like to see this area built, but that he is not comfortable with the varying interpretations of the UDD or the extent of the alternate compliance being sought.

Chairman Sanger commented that a development could be built all the way to Carl's Deli if so approved.

Mike Schoedel reminded everyone that the UDD is not just for this corner. He stated if the base zoning is considered, this is a commercially zoned district and that the UDD was an attempt to "soften" this commercial zone. He stated it is a difficult balance.

Chairman Sanger commented that the UDD is a guideline, not a directive.

Mike Schoedel stated that the sale of the City owned lot is clearly appropriate and that continued ownership of this lot by the City is not in the City's best interest.

Chairman Sanger asked Mr. Stephens if he wanted postponement of a vote since there is one member missing this evening.

Mr. Stephens replied "no".

Debbie Igielnik made a motion to recommend the sale of the City owned lot to the Board of Aldermen, seconded by Mark Zorensky. The motion passed unanimously.

Mark Zorensky made a motion to recommend the lot consolidation to the Board of Aldermen, seconded by Debbie Igielnik. The motion passed unanimously.

Kevin O'Keefe stated that the lot consolidation is subject to closing (acquisition) of the City lot and its inclusion in the consolidation and development of the lots.

At this time, a brief discussion regarding the planters took place.

Mark Zorensky made a motion to approve the site plan subject to staff recommendations as follows:

1. The applicant provide an escrow to the City in an amount as determined by the Public Works Department and as to form acceptable to the City Attorney to cover the costs for future alley widening for the portion of the alley immediately adjacent to the subject site prior to the issuance of a building permit.
2. That signage prohibiting **right** turns into the alley from the parking lot be installed.
3. The elimination of on-street parking on University Lane from Clayton Road to the alley.
4. That the applicant pay \$12,000 into the City's Forestry Fund for caliper deficiency or provide additional trees per staff review and approval.
5. That the alternative compliance request be granted to allow the building length not exceed 206'4" as shown on the plans
6. That the alternative compliance request be granted to allow an increase in front yard impervious coverage to 47%.

\*Note that certain language contained in recommendation No. 6 of staff's site plan review memorandum pertaining to elimination of the planter boxes was NOT included in the motion, thereby allowing the planter boxes.

The motion was seconded by Mike Schoedel and received the following vote: Ayes: Chairman Sanger, Mike Schoedel, Mark Zorensky, Jim Liberman and Debbie Igielnik. Nays: Marc Lopata. The motion carried.

Mark Zorensky asked that the ARB portion of the project be continued.

Mike Schoedel made a motion to continue the architectural aspects of this project, seconded by Mark Zorensky. Motion carried unanimously.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary